



Security Council

Sixty-sixth year

Provisional

6533rd meeting

Thursday, 12 May 2011, 10 a

New York

President:	Mr. Araud	(France)
Members:	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Mr. Barbalic
	Brazil	Mrs. Viotti
	China	Mr. Yang Tao
	Colombia	Mr. Alzate
	Gabon	Mr. Messone
	Germany	Mr. Wittig
	India	Mr. Manjeev Singh Puri
	Lebanon	Ms. Ziade
	Nigeria	Mrs. Ogwu
	Portugal	Mr. Cabral
	Russian Federation	Mr. Pankin
	South Africa	Mr. Sangqu
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Parham
	United States of America	Ms. Rice

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Identical letters dated 18 February 2011 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council (S/2011/85)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.



The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Identical letters dated 18 February 2011 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council (S/2011/85)

The President (*spoke in French*): Under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite Mr. Jean-Marie Guéhenno, Chair of the Senior Advisory Group for the Review of International Civilian Capacities; Ms. Susana Malcorra, Under-Secretary-General for Field Support; and Mr. Eugène-Richard Gasana, Permanent Representative of Rwanda, in his capacity as Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission, to participate in this meeting.

The Security Council will now bring its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I wish to draw the attention of Council members to document S/2011/85, which contains the text of a letter dated 18 February 2011 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council transmitting the report of the independent review on civilian capacity in the aftermath of conflict.

I now give the floor to Mr. Jean-Marie Guéhenno.

Mr. Guéhenno (*spoke in French*): At the outset, I should like to thank you, Sir, for having invited me to this meeting to present to the Council the report of the Senior Advisory Group on civilian capacity (S/2011/85). I should also like to thank Under-Secretary-General Malcorra and the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, Ambassador Gasana, for being here today.

The report before the Council is truly the product of a collaborative effort. I note the presence here today of Ambassador Mitra Vasisht, a member of the Advisory Group. I believe without the diversity of points of view expressed in the Group, we would not be where we are today. This report is a result of a collective effort also in terms of the diversity and variety of the consultations we were able to hold in the preparatory phase. We met with Member States, regional organizations, civil society, individuals

affected by conflict and actors from conflict zones, and their points of view inform this report.

Let me first make a few remarks on the origins of this report. As Council members know, it arose from growing concerns among the international community, and the United Nations in particular, on how to provide, in a timely manner, people with the needed qualities in difficult situations, and how to deploy them rapidly in conflict-affected areas. This difficulty, which is common to all major multisectoral missions, affects the ability of United Nations missions — missions authorized by the Council — to fulfil their mandates and thus to build lasting peace. This is the overarching problem that our report aims to address.

Of course, it is not a new problem. Members will recall that during a debate in the General Assembly last June marking the tenth anniversary of the Brahimi report (S/2000/809), Lakhdar Brahimi noted that there is no substitute for getting the right people into the right jobs at the right time, and only for the time that is necessary. He went on to say that many peacekeeping veterans had told the panel he chaired in 2000 that the civilian personnel system was failing peacekeeping missions and that if there was only one problem to fix as a priority, it should be this. Ten years later, regrettably, he expressed his fear that many of the problems identified in 2000 had not yet been resolved.

In the past ten years, the operating environment of missions has become considerably more complicated, and the expectations of the international community have also significantly changed. The scope of the missions mandated by the Council has continued to expand, with missions playing ever more diverse and varied roles covering a very wide range of activities relating to the re-establishment of peace and security. This requires much greater agility at Headquarters and on the ground and a much broader range of skills and expertise, including specialized skills that are often hard to find.

(*spoke in English*)

As the Secretary-General said during the Council's debate on post-conflict peacebuilding and institution building in January (S/PV.6472), "More nimble and agile systems are also required, including stronger partnerships that can provide the most appropriate civilian capacity", particularly from the Global South and among women.

I would like to say a few words on the key features of the report. Council members are already familiar with its four main areas: national ownership, global partnership, expertise and nimbleness. I would like to explain why it was these four key issues that we chose to concentrate on.

First, national ownership. As the Peacebuilding Commission has emphasized, unless conflict-affected countries develop their own capacities to cope with crisis and change, international assistance will not succeed. Yet we heard repeatedly from conflict-affected countries that we do not sufficiently respect national ownership or develop national capacities. In Liberia, for example, where the last peace agreement was concluded in 2003, despite the international community's efforts since then, the lack of specialized capacity in many areas remains a major challenge. For the Liberian National Police alone, civilian expertise is needed in the areas of administration, communications, criminal investigation, institutional capacity-building and logistics. We need more than just the uniformed personnel, who of course play a critical role; there is a whole supporting civilian environment that needs to be developed in parallel.

Our report is therefore founded on the principle that international assistance has to identify, protect and nurture latent national capabilities — in short, that it must build on what is already there, not start from a blank slate. That means stronger support to core State capacities, such as aid coordination, policy and public financial management, maximizing the economic impact of our interventions through local procurement, and using local capacities as much as possible, including in professional positions in United Nations missions. This support has to start early. In Southern Sudan, for example, I hope that the United Nations will aim to build up the capacities of the Southern Sudanese to articulate their priorities so that it will be the Southern Sudanese themselves, who will truly shape the future of their country, with the United Nations planning process then aligning with those nationally defined priorities.

The second area of focus is partnerships. Conflict-affected countries have increasingly specialized needs in a variety of fields, from natural resource management, as we have seen in Liberia, to land management in Darfur, harbour management in Timor-Leste — the scope is unlimited. The United Nations obviously cannot hope to meet all of these

needs from its own ranks. Instead, it needs to establish and operate effective partnerships with outside providers, as many agencies, funds and programmes already do. We therefore recommend establishing a civilian partnership cell to link field needs to the capacities of Member State and non-governmental organization and to enable faster, more effective deployment of Member State capacities.

We emphasize, too, the need for greater South-South cooperation and triangular cooperation. The sort of expertise needed in conflict-affected countries can often be found in countries with a recent experience of transition or institutional transformation. South Africa, for example, has provided electoral and mediation expertise in Burundi. The capacity development needs of the Liberian National Police are being supported by neighbours in the subregion. Triangular cooperation is helping restore and strengthen core State functions in South Sudan, where 200 advisors from the Intergovernmental Authority on Development and 150 United Nations Volunteers, supported by the United Nations Development Programme, will be outposted to work at the local level with Government counterparts and provided with technical and advisory support.

The next issue of focus is expertise. The Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in 2009 (S/2009/304) stressed the need for predictable delivery of assistance in the core areas of peacebuilding. Yet efforts are still hampered by the lack of quickly deployable expert capacity, including in such mission-critical areas as the rule of law. Part of the problem is a lack of clarity about roles and responsibilities, with gaps in some areas and overlap in others where multiple actors do the same tasks under competing mandates. This is why the report recommends establishing a clear model defining who does what, with clearly designated leads for all areas. The aims here are to strengthen responsibility and accountability, and to fill obvious capacity gaps.

The last is of focus is nimbleness. The Secretary-General's representatives in the field are entrusted by the Security Council with great political and diplomatic responsibility to carry out the Council's mandates. But when it comes to management, they actually often have very little flexibility and need the authority to adapt their implementation plans to react to the unforeseen and to seize opportunities. The implementation of their mandates could sometimes be well served by missions being enabled to undertake certain programmatic

activities, at least before United Nations agencies, funds and programmes have got their programmes under way. Examples such as the community violence reduction programme carried out by the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti, and a road-building scheme managed by the United Nations Mission in Liberia that employed 75,000 Liberians, a third of them ex-combatants, are illustrations of the enormous potential value of using mission funds for carefully targeted programmes within the mandate.

The report also makes one cross-cutting recommendation for more seamless arrangements within the United Nations to enable rapid response and interoperability across the system. This points, I must say, to a deeper problem — a single human resources system that tries to cater both to the recruitment of Headquarters staff and to the management of field missions. These are two vastly different tasks, perhaps impossible to do within one single set of rules without at least some adaptations.

In conclusion, let me stress that the international community has too often missed the window of opportunity that the immediate post-conflict period offers to provide basic security, deliver peace dividends, build confidence in political processes and strengthen core national capacities to lead peacebuilding efforts.

The stakes are very high. As the recently published *World Development Report* underlines,

“insecurity ... has become the primary development challenge of our time. One-and-a-half billion people live in areas affected by fragility, conflict, or large-scale, organized criminal violence, and no low-income fragile or conflict-affected country has yet to achieve a single United Nations Millennium Development Goal”.

To meet the needs of post-conflict countries, the United Nations currently tries to recruit a vast array of specialized personnel instead of building partnerships that will provide access to the necessary capacities as and when they are needed. Inevitably, then, its response to conflict is determined by the supply of its own human resources, and not by demand. Improving the way we deliver civilian capacity requires a shift from this supply-driven to a demand-driven approach that respects and understands the needs of conflict-affected countries and adapts itself to fill them, rather than simply providing the capacities it happens to have.

It requires going outside the boxes that we have built to describe our activities in post-conflict peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. These have sometimes proved to be an obstacle rather than a help because the reality is that the effort to rebuild a country that has suffered conflict is really a continuum. Too often, because of those boxes, our interventions are like a cliff, with at one stage a massive engagement and then suddenly very little. We do not know how to turn that cliff into a more gentle slope, which is really what is needed.

Our recommendations are intended to equip the international community to better respond to these demands. To that end, we envision a core of United Nations staff working in close partnership with host communities and civilians from Member States, regional organizations and other partners, accessing temporary capacities in response to need.

A meeting organized by the United Nations and the African Union in Addis Ababa in December 2010 was quite clear on this point. The concluding statement of that meeting said, in part:

“The spirit of partnership must drive the next generation of engagement with conflict-affected States. The United Nations must be open and respectful. It must engage host communities, Member States which have appropriate capacities, regional and subregional organizations, civil society and the private sector, with a willingness to learn from them and adapt.”

This message goes to the very heart of the report.

Our ideas and proposals are now for Member States and the Secretary-General to weigh and consider. I hope that some of them will prove of some value. I thank the members of the Council for their interest, and look forward to hearing their views on our report and its relevance to their work.

The President (spoke in French): I thank Mr. Guéhenno for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Ms. Malcorra.

Ms. Malcorra: I thank you, Sir, for inviting me to this meeting and giving me the opportunity to hear members' views and discuss the follow-up of the report of the Senior Advisory Group on civilian capacity (see S/2001/85). I am happy to see Jean-Marie Guéhenno

and Ambassador Gasana, representing the Peacebuilding Commission today.

Civilian capacity is a vital component of almost all the missions that the Council authorizes. From large, multidimensional peacekeeping operations to smaller, more specialized political missions, all need extensive civilian expertise to fulfil their mandates. When the Secretary-General produced his first report on peacebuilding (S/2009/304) in the immediate aftermath of conflict in 2009, the Council stressed the importance of rapidly deployable civilian expertise to help develop national capacities as early as possible. It was in that regard that the Council welcomed the Secretary-General's proposal for a review to analyse how to broaden and deepen the pool of civilian experts — a review that has now produced the report we have before us today.

The Secretary-General has welcomed the direction articulated by the report. The recommendations are congruent with his broader efforts to create a more open and responsive United Nations working in close partnership with Member States. The Secretary-General has stressed that the report's emphasis on the need to do more within existing resources and to make better use of the systems already in place is also in line with his continuing drive to build a more accountable, efficient and effective United Nations. I see a great deal of congruence between the report's recommendations and the priorities the Council has long identified for improving our collective performance in supporting conflict-affected countries.

First, with respect to national ownership, the entire report is based on the premise that unless national Governments, peoples and institutions truly own their peacebuilding processes, peace will not last. Identifying and developing latent national capacity is always difficult, but it has to be built into our objectives and our work plans from the very start.

The Council has emphasized the need for early and predictable support in priority areas of peacebuilding, including security sector reform and the rule of law, respect for human rights and refugee return, core Government functions and economic revitalization. The report recognizes those that currently lack the capacity to respond to demand. But there is also the question of the national capacity to manage and direct such assistance. The Council has

rightly stressed the vital role of the United Nations in supporting national authorities to develop an early strategy to address their peacebuilding priorities. The report, too, says that we must do better at supporting Governments in building the core structures needed for policy management and prioritization, aid coordination and public financial management. This is congruent with key findings and messages in the newly released *World Development Report*.

With regard to partnerships, delivering more effective civilian capacity needs to be a collective effort. It is neither practicable nor wise for the United Nations to try to recruit as staff members individuals with all the myriad skills and experience that are necessary to meet post-conflict needs, either now or in an unknown future. What the report recommends, instead, is for the United Nations to supplement its core staff by investing in long-term partnerships with external providers who can furnish the necessary niche capacity on a more flexible, on-demand basis. Building such partnerships will be of mutual benefit. Not only will the United Nations gain access to new sources of capacity that are currently underused, but Member States and other partners will have increased opportunities for deploying their civilian capacities in partnership with the United Nations. This is the point of the report's recommendations for greater South-South cooperation and triangular partnerships, and for associated modalities like experts on mission or civilian support packages, to enable them to work smoothly.

Lastly, with regard to the importance of translating proposed changes into improved effectiveness of operations on the ground, many of the recommendations in the report concern United Nations rules or management practices at Headquarters. But there is little point in changes at Headquarters if they do not ultimately improve our performance in the field, that is, the value of our assistance to conflict-affected countries. As we move ahead and consider which of the report's ideas we can usefully apply, and how, I am determined that we should maintain a clear focus on the field and on how our work is going to make an impact there. I therefore intend to involve representatives from the field in meetings of our Steering Committee whenever possible.

Next, let me turn to the way ahead. As Chair of the Steering Committee appointed by the Secretary-General to take the report forward, we are working on

the basis of certain key principles. First, we shall be open and consultative. The entire United Nations system, Member States and other external partners all need to be involved if we are to crystallize a set of actionable recommendations from the report. Consultations will also help us understand what capacities are available beyond the United Nations but not being fully used. The debate that took place in the General Assembly yesterday has already given us indications that will inform the process moving forward.

We have to align our work with other initiatives and reforms across the United Nations system that fit with what we are trying to do. Some of the report's human resources recommendations, for example, may be more productively pursued within other work streams. By putting these things under a civilian capacity chapeau, we may be able to lend them a sharper focus, sense of urgency and added value.

We are adopting a holistic, system-wide approach. The Steering Committee established by the Secretary-General includes our development and humanitarian colleagues. The World Bank has shown interest in joining, and we are working on a way to make that happen. Our meetings so far have shown that there is much constructive interest across the system in how the report can be acted upon, even though there may be differences of opinion about exactly how to do it. There is, moreover, broad agreement on the key goals, namely, to better enable national capacity development, to develop mechanisms for effective partnerships with external capacities and to design more seamless arrangements within the United Nations to enable a rapid response to crises. That is an encouraging basis on which to move ahead.

Lastly, we need to be selective. The report contains more than 70 recommendations. Some changes that appear simple may in practice be difficult. Others, though, can be done within the Secretary-General's or his executive heads' own purview. We need to identify those that offer the greatest return on investment and prioritize them. We also need to test some of these ideas, especially in the field. South Sudan, for example, should the Security Council authorize a United Nations mission there, may present opportunities. But we must also be realistic. Some recommendations need systemic change, and they will take some time.

Where do we go from here? I look forward to hearing Council members' views on the report and what they consider to be opportunities for early action. The Secretary-General will wish to reflect on these as he considers how to take the report forward. He will then indicate which recommendations he intends to implement, and how — probably in the form of a report to the membership after the summer. This will be a long journey, and we are just beginning here.

The President (spoke in French): I thank Ms. Malcorra for her briefing.

I now give the floor to Mr. Eugène-Richard Gasana.

Mr. Gasana (Rwanda) (spoke in French): I should like to thank the Security Council for its ever-growing interest in the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) by inviting us from time to time to contribute to the Council's lofty undertaking, as enormous and invaluable as it is for human kind as a whole. Allow me also to formally reiterate my congratulations, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month.

(spoke in English)

The Peacebuilding Commission has prioritized national ownership as a central principle in ensuring sustainable peace and preventing a relapse into conflict. To that end, beyond rhetoric and slogans, the Commission believes that ownership is best understood and meaningful in the context of three primary areas, namely, first, a national vision for, and leadership of, the political and peacebuilding processes; secondly, adequate human and institutional capacities in critical areas of security, governance and economic generation; and, thirdly, the inclusiveness of all segments of the society.

The Commission considers the review of civilian capacity as a window of opportunity for the international community to address the second area, namely, the adequate development of human and institutional capacities, and to recognize the urgency with which we need to improve our collective response to that challenging task. In the context of taking forward the relevant recommendations from the 2010 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, the Commission has prioritized national capacity development for the countries on its agenda as a key area requiring immediate attention this year.

In that connection, the Commission was periodically engaged throughout the consultative process which produced the ambitious report (S/2011/85) that is before us today. The members of the Commission have also been closely involved through the informal consultative group chaired by Canada, a member of the Commission and the Chair of its Sierra Leone configuration. Recently, following the release of the report, the Commission had informal interactions with our outstanding and efficient Under-Secretary-General, Susana Malcorra, Chair of the Steering Group, who shared with us her thinking on the next steps to be taken.

There is a need to operationalize actions across the four areas covered by the report: ownership, partnership, expertise and nimbleness. We appreciate the fact that in order to operationalize the outcome of the review, we must prioritize those actions that could deliver the most immediate and tangible improvements in the field. However, we recognize also that high expectations have already been generated by the process. We hope that we can, to the extent possible, match practicality with expectations, and realism with the urgency of introducing changes. I am not suggesting that this will be a simple task for the Secretary-General, as it will necessarily feed into the broader efforts of United Nations reform.

On substance, I would like to touch on the following elements, which the Commission deems of particular significance in going forward.

First, capacity needs in the countries concerned must be viewed within the framework of the most pressing peacebuilding needs and priorities, which are country-specific and time-bound. Therefore, the priority-setting exercise must be owned nationally, and our response must be demand-driven.

Secondly, we need to improve the way in which we identify and classify existing national and local capacities. Practical mechanisms that could enable, train and deploy such capacities, including among the diaspora, must be put in place. Our focus must be on enabling, not substituting for, local capacities.

Thirdly, leveraging capacities and expertise in the neighbouring regions, the global South and among women and civil society actors is a key feature of the review. We recognize, however, that translating that objective into practical reality will be particularly challenging, not least on the funding front. Enabling a

more peacebuilding-oriented focus and the interoperability of existing South-South cooperation and capacity-building mechanisms with United Nations system-wide mechanisms deserves our immediate attention.

Fourthly, women's empowerment must remain a high-priority area in the context of this exercise. We need to approach this area in conjunction with ongoing efforts to strengthen women's participation in peacebuilding processes, as indicated in the recent report of the Secretary-General (S/2010/466) and his seven-point action plan.

Member States have expressed their wish to remain closely engaged in and consulted throughout the process leading to the Secretary-General's submission of his report on operationalizing the review. As a forum that works across organizational boundaries and addresses the entire continuum of peacebuilding activities, the Peacebuilding Commission stands ready to offer a space for such consultations, bringing together a broad range of stakeholders. That might help to facilitate coherence and complementarity with ongoing efforts and initiatives, such as the operationalizing of the *World Development Report 2011*. In that connection, we also look forward to performing our function as an advisory body to the Security Council and the General Assembly as the two organs take forward their respective legislative mandates.

The President (spoke in French): I thank Mr. Eugène-Richard Gasana for his statement. The Council believes that the work being carried out by the Peacebuilding Commission is of the greatest importance, and I wish to thank all three speakers for the contributions they made.

I now give the floor to members of the Council who wish to make statements.

Ms. Rice (United States of America): I, too, wish to thank former Under-Secretary-General Guéhenno and Under-Secretary-General Malcorra for their statements and the Senior Advisory Group that Mr. Guéhenno chaired for their excellent efforts. I am grateful also to Ambassador Gasana for his statement and for his very able leadership of the Peacebuilding Commission.

The United States welcomes this important and timely report (S/2011/85) on civilian capacity in the

aftermath of conflict. We appreciate its level of ambition, and we look forward to studying its recommendations and working with colleagues on ways to take the agenda forward together.

When new Governments emerge from the ashes of devastating conflict, they face countless challenges. These range from establishing critical State functions and services to shepherding political transition and building confidence among former adversaries to laying the groundwork for economic recovery and longer-term development.

Peace is always too long in coming after bloody conflict, but even when we see it coming, we are often not well prepared to offer the most timely and relevant support. Countries seeking to rebuild cannot afford the average six months or more it can take to identify and deploy the expertise they need. When there is a requirement for specialized capabilities, whether judges or police trainers, legal and constitutional experts, public administrators or economic advisers, our instruments are often not well tailored to deliver.

As much as post-conflict countries may need support from external partners, we are also very much mindful of the reviews urging us not to overlook capacity that may already be in place, even in the most damaged areas. We need to ensure that international efforts enhance capacities that already exist rather than displace or replace them.

We appreciate the main themes of the review: the call for much greater seriousness about national ownership, the openness to wider and more diverse partnerships, the importance of expertise relevant to specific contexts and the need for management practices that are responsive to fluid post-conflict environments. We welcome the practical, concrete recommendations. We see this exercise as an important opportunity to draw together and to enhance some of our existing efforts to strengthen peacekeeping, peacebuilding and internal support to peace processes. We fully support the review's emphasis on gender and its ideas for recruiting and retaining more women across the United Nations and the wider international system.

At this stage we would welcome further consideration of several issues.

First, as has been mentioned, we will soon be formulating a mandate for a new mission in South

Sudan, and we see this as an opportunity, as has been suggested, to advance some of the review's important ideas in this context. We would welcome an opportunity — as a Council and interactively with our colleagues from the Secretariat — to explore how best to do this.

Secondly, we need to ask ourselves what the Secretariat can already do, now, to improve its ability to identify and deploy relevant civilian expertise, and how Member States can best support these efforts.

Thirdly, the review underscores the need for closer cooperation between international financial institutions and the political and security presences, as we have just discussed — a point that was also underscored by the *2011 World Development Report* on conflict-affected and fragile States. What can we do now to forge more productive partnerships with the international financial institutions and donor entities?

In this Chamber we know all too well that it is not enough for soldiers to keep the peace unless parallel efforts are made to address the underlying drivers of conflict and to build the foundation for a lasting peace that will enable troops to return home. This civilian capacity review report makes an important contribution to helping us get this right. There is much here to digest, assess and debate.

We appreciate Under-Secretary-General Malcorra's appeal to prioritize, and we welcome her leadership. We also thank the Secretary-General for his ongoing commitment to this issue, and now our work — that of the membership — begins. We have an important new opportunity to make progress in our collective efforts to support countries recovering from war. Let us work together to seize it.

Mr. Manjeev Singh Puri (India): I have listened with much interest to what the Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission has had to say, as well as to the briefings by the Chair of the Senior Advisory Group and by Under-Secretary-General Malcorra.

Peacekeeping operations mandated by this Council have been the main instrument for United Nations action on the ground for conflict resolution. They have stood the test of time and will remain the critical pillar of United Nations activities for years to come. They have also provided the umbrella for peacebuilding activities. However, over the years, we in this Council have invariably added to the mandates

of peacekeeping missions. The critical imperative is therefore for placing adequate resources at their disposal.

As many of the situations where United Nations peacekeeping missions are operating are those of prolonged conflict or are post conflict, it is essential that the United Nations missions involve themselves in building local capacities for the provision of basic administration and essential services. Civilian capacities are critical in this endeavour, and their presence in a significantly enhanced manner in United Nations peacekeeping missions has to engage us here in the United Nations as Member States.

We are very appreciative of the work done by Mr. Jean-Marie Guéhenno and the Senior Advisory Group in examining the issue in detail and making recommendations on how enhanced civilian capacity could be incorporated in the work of the United Nations in post-conflict situations. We have also noted that the Secretary-General has set up a steering group to facilitate follow-up of the report of the independent review on civilian capacity in the aftermath of conflict (see S/2011/85) and that Under-Secretary-General Malcorra will be leading that effort.

This is a detailed report, and the issues of enhanced civilian capacities require that we engage ourselves as Member States. At the United Nations we have a number of institutions in which we will have to do this, including the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and the Fifth Committee. Significantly enhancing civilian capacities will have a major impact on the staffing, resourcing and impact of peacekeeping missions, but these must neither dilute nor detract from the requirements of peacekeeping.

The open framework and the cluster approach to identifying tasks and responsibilities in the aftermath of conflict could help in better defining peacebuilding priorities and tasks. The concept of a lead agency has to be reconciled with the requirement of unity of command, so essential in peacekeeping, and to ensure that peacebuilding does not fall victim to turf battles. There will also be demands for creating entities in New York to administer these advanced civilian capacities. We need to avoid setting up large and top-heavy bureaucratic structures. Our focus must remain on the field and delivery there.

The Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) has been acting on the provision of police

capacities for many years, and I am happy that India has been able to contribute both formed police units — including the first female formed police unit — and senior police personnel to serve in management and command positions.

The report has identified several critical areas for providing core government functions where civilian capacities are best suited. India has been included as one of the countries whose capacity in several of these areas has been noticed for possible tapping by the United Nations. In the past, when called upon to provide civilian capacities for United Nations missions, India has responded promptly. I recall the secondment of several of our civilian officials to United Nations missions in the former Yugoslavia and even right now in Afghanistan.

The report has underscored recognition of national ownership and the importance of support to core government functions to ensure success in preventing relapse into conflict. It is critical that national ownership is accepted in its real sense, and not only by way of lip service while actually pushing for the solutions favoured by the donors. It is also critical that civilian capacity deployments are demand-driven.

My delegation believes that the recruitment model should give primacy to a partnership with Governments of Member States and involve the secondment of Government officials. It is also important to ensure gender balance. This has a number of advantages. It gives the United Nations rapid access to the required capacities, allowing rapid scaling up and scaling down of capacities. Above all it provides capacities that are trained to work in and establish government structures, and it would mesh well with the peacekeeping personnel on the ground. The DPKO has a fourth-generation model. Perhaps that too could be used to generate civilian capacities from Governments of Member States.

My delegation also believes that the capacities that are being sourced must be relevant to the conditions in post-conflict situations. The expertise that is most relevant and actually tried on the ground is in developing countries that have undertaken successful efforts in recent times in building government structures and arranging for better delivery of basic services. There is an international shift in many fields towards sourcing capabilities from the global South, driven by sound economic and functional

considerations. United Nations efforts to source civilian capacities from developing nations would be in consonance with these broad prints.

The United Nations remains, in the eyes of the affected, the most credible and legitimate representative of the international community. Its peacekeeping activities have provided the bedrock of this trust. It is imperative that civilian capacities add to this credibility.

Mr. Wittig (Germany): I thank Jean-Marie Guéhenno and Under-Secretary-General Susana Malcorra for their comprehensive briefings. I would like to commend Mr. Guéhenno and the Senior Advisor Group for their excellent review of civilian capacity in the aftermath of conflict (see S/2011/85). I am also happy to see Ambassador Gasana, the Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission, here among us, and I thank him for his contribution.

This is a welcome opportunity to start a collective effort. The key challenge, particularly in the period immediately following a ceasefire or a peace agreement, is this: how to secure the best civilian capacities needed to build sustainable peace. This includes the re-establishment of institutions of government, rule of law, respect for human rights and economic revitalization.

The response of the international community and the United Nations in this field is still too fragmented and often too late. We need to do better to enable national ownership, to work in partnership and to improve the effectiveness, appropriateness and timeliness of United Nations support to conflict-affected countries.

We therefore welcome the findings of the independent report, including the recognition of the critical role of women in peacebuilding. We also welcome and support the leadership of Under-Secretary-General Malcorra to take forward the implementation process with the Steering Group.

When considering the next steps in the follow-up to the report, I would like to highlight three priorities.

First, all efforts should aim at the leanest system that works and is needs-based, flexible and results-oriented. This also includes working towards leaner and more flexible missions in terms of civilian staff wherever possible. Duplication within the United Nations system and gaps need to be identified and

addressed. Recruitment procedures for civilian experts need to be streamlined and simplified. As the report points out, the United Nations can implement many of the recommendations without legislative changes. I would like to encourage the Secretary-General to take all the necessary steps to that end, and to welcome the intention to develop a prioritized road map on the way ahead, which should also indicate where action by Member States is required.

Secondly, instead of setting up new and costly structures, focus needs to be on making better use of existing resources and systems already in place. Partnerships are an essential element in this context, including South-South cooperation. The European Union has a broad set of instruments and expertise through its Common Security and Defence Policy and its civilian crisis management missions. We encourage the Secretariat to pool the efforts to deliver and train resources, as proposed by the European Union in yesterday's debate in the General Assembly.

Building on partnerships between the United Nations and regional and subregional organizations will also be vital, as is making use of the tools and instruments provided by the international financial institutions, notably the World Bank, and engaging the private sector.

Germany stands ready to provide expertise through our Center for International Peace Operations, to assist the compact support team to be established by Under-Secretary-General Malcorra. The Center maintains a national stand-by roster of trained experts who are ready to be deployed in peace operations of the United Nations, the European Union and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. The Center also offers to provide in-mission training, and we look forward to discussing this in detail with the compact support team.

Thirdly, it is important to draw on lessons learned, best practices and evaluation results. The cluster approach of the humanitarian system was recently evaluated in 2010, and the Inter-Agency Standing Committee is currently working on implementing the recommendations. Existing reform processes, such as the implementation of the global field support strategy, need to be taken into account.

We should start to take concrete steps without delay. South Sudan could be, as was pointed out, the first test case and starting point. Critical needs, notably

the establishment of Government institutions and justice, will have to be addressed swiftly. Attention should therefore be paid to identifying and supporting effectively national capacities, including the capacities of the diasporas. Furthermore, the Security Council will have to consider the initiation of peacebuilding in mandates and, from the outset of a mandate, how best to integrate the building of partnerships.

It is not for the Security Council alone to follow up on the process. Joint action is required by the Secretary-General, the Secretariat and United Nations bodies, including the Peacebuilding Commission and the General Assembly. Creating effective ways to make civilian capacity available to support peacebuilding in conflict-affected countries is the best way to secure national ownership and make peace and reconstruction sustainable. My country is willing to work with the United Nations and all partners to that end.

Mr. Sangqu (South Africa): South Africa welcomes the report by the Senior Advisory Group (see S/2011/85) on the review of international civilian capacity in the aftermath of conflict. We welcome the briefings by Jean-Marie Guéhenno, Chair of the Senior Advisory Group for the review of international civilian capacity, and by Under-Secretary-General for Field Support Susana Malcorra. I also thank Ambassador Gasana, Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, for his statement.

As communities emerge from conflict, they often face a critical shortage of capacities needed to secure sustainable socio-economic development, lasting peace and security and much-needed stability. More often than not, we have seen that countries emerging from conflict lack the very basic capacities to run a Government. They experience setbacks in their disarmament, demobilization and reintegration processes and are confronted with distressed economies. This state of affairs increases the likelihood of relapse into conflict.

International civilian capacities will require strengthening in providing support in the following areas: political processes; the re-establishment of national institutions; the reform of judicial systems; the promotion of respect for human rights; transitional justice mechanisms, including truth and reconciliation and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration processes; the integration of armed forces; and, more important, economic recovery.

Today's debate gives us an opportunity to explore how the United Nations and international players, including the donor community, could better utilize existing international civilian capacities and resources to complement existing local and national capacities in countries emerging from conflict.

In the light of this, my delegation welcomes the recommendations made in the report of the Senior Advisory Group. These recommendations are important, as they are aimed at strengthening national ownership, broadening and deepening the pool of international civilian capacities and improving the appropriateness, timeliness and effectiveness of United Nations support.

The United Nations has traditionally focused on humanitarian and peacekeeping operations, and there has been little success in supporting and enabling the national capacities that are essential for enduring peace.

My delegation would like to focus on only two of the main recommendations in the report, namely, national ownership and building partnerships.

Given the effects of conflict, local capacities may be weakened, thus making them unavailable or scarce. In other situations, although ravaged by conflict, there will still be more national capacity than is at first apparent. Such latent capacities must be protected and nurtured. My delegation would like to emphasize the salience of ensuring that national capacities are central, and not just an appendage in post-conflict reconstruction. The failure to tap into capacities that are already in place, or to nurture and strengthen such capacities where they are lacking, will create a dangerous dependency syndrome, which will continue to stretch the meagre resources of the international community.

By developing international civilian capacities, we will be encouraging sustainable development as the key to ensuring that countries do not relapse into conflict. We need to acknowledge that we have not sufficiently tapped into existing international capacities, in particular from the global South and the North. As we seek to broaden and deepen the pool of civilian capacities and experts, we also need to utilize the comparative advantage of regional and subregional organizations and leverage the crucial but often neglected capacity of women.

South Africa recognizes the importance of both national ownership and building partnerships. In order to develop local capacities, my Government has begun capacity-building programmes for countries emerging from conflict. For example, in addition to our recent humble contribution in Burundi in the area of election management, as recognized by Mr. Guéhenno today, we have, over the years, contributed to the training of over 1,500 officials of the Government of South Sudan in cross-cutting fields including diplomacy, public service and public finance and management. We have also entered into a triangular partnership with Germany, to provide training in South Sudan on correctional, judicial and legal services.

As is always the case, the development of national and international civilian capacities in the aftermath of conflict will not succeed without the provision of predictable, flexible and sustainable sources of funding. My delegation looks forward to further interactions on the report on civilian capacities as Under-Secretary-General Malcorra takes forward the report's recommendations.

Mr. Parham (United Kingdom): Many thanks to you, Mr. President, for convening this debate. I also express my thanks for the briefings that we have heard. Given the mounting demands on the United Nations to support countries emerging from conflict, such as the Sudan and Côte d'Ivoire, this debate provides a timely opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to improve the effectiveness of the United Nations in peacebuilding.

I would like to thank Mr. Guéhenno, the Senior Advisory Group and the team based in the Peacebuilding Support Office for their efforts in generating the report before us (see S/2011/85). I am also delighted that Under-Secretary-General Susana Malcorra has been appointed to lead its implementation. We fully support the overarching approach of the report.

The international community, including the United Nations, needs to be much more effective in helping build national capacities in post-conflict countries. The focus needs initially to be on building institutions that can generate the critical survival functions of the State: security, the rule of law and the economy. Without progress on security, justice and jobs, people will have little confidence in a nascent peace process or the State authorities. However, that will need to expand rapidly into other expected State

functions, such as basic services, infrastructure and economic management.

Getting the right civilian expertise deployed promptly to help a country deliver those core functions is therefore critical, but, as the report emphasizes, local capacity should have primacy. International capacity should only be used as a last resort. It is therefore important that international support be based on a thorough assessment of existing local capacity.

To help where international deployments are needed, we support the proposal of establishing a civilian partnerships cell so that the United Nations can better tap into the expertise of Member States, regional organizations and other partners. Such a cell will help to widen the network of expertise and thus improve the ability to select people with intimate knowledge of a region or post-conflict needs. A network of centres of excellence will help to improve the quality and availability of experts and the supply to the United Nations and others. We need to see the benefits of such recommendations working quickly on the ground.

The report also rightly highlights the need for effective leadership. Successful United Nations missions depend on strong leadership. We must select the best candidates based on competence alone. We support the need for better training of leaders so that they can manage the post-conflict response more effectively.

We also agree with the need for greater unity of effort so that we have a clear sense within the United Nations of who is doing what. That will be supported by having a clearer delineation of roles and responsibilities for the core peacebuilding sectors. Without that, we will not get the right investment to ensure a predictable and professional response. That is ever more important in an environment where resources are constrained.

However, we feel that some of the report's recommendations need further clarity and consultation, particularly those concerning the flexibility of mission resources. We welcome Under-Secretary-General Malcorra's plans to consult closely with Member States as that and other recommendations are taken up. Where recommendations are taken forward, that must happen within existing resource allocations.

Finally, we welcome the plan for the Secretary-General to prepare a response to this initial report in the autumn.

Mr. Messone (Gabon) (spoke in French): The mobilization and the deployment of civilian expertise in post-conflict situations is one of the priorities of United Nations peacebuilding activity. In May 2008, under the United Kingdom presidency, the Council addressed this issue for the first time (see S/PV.5895). The Council emphasized the need to swiftly deploy civilian expertise in the two years following the end of a conflict.

Allow me, too, to thank Mr. Jean-Marie Guéhenno and Under-Secretary-General Ms. Susana Malcorra for their presentation of the report of the Senior Advisory Group tasked with considering this issue (see S/2011/85). I would also like to thank Ambassador Gasana for his intervention, providing the point of view of the Peacebuilding Commission, to which we give our full support.

On the one hand, the report enables us to highlight the shortfalls in the transition between peacekeeping activities and the restoration of peace. It also enables us to assess peacebuilding experiences in recent years in Afghanistan, Somalia, Burundi, Guinea-Bissau and the Central African Republic in order to draw relevant lessons. Countries emerging from conflict often lack the means needed to establish lasting peace, in particular in areas such as the restoration of a judicial system and administration, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, security sector reform and the re-establishment of economic activity and social services, such as education, health care and so on.

My delegation supports the recommendations of the Secretary-General seeking to establish a reliable and credible partnership between countries in crisis and the international community that takes account of the country's potential, the aspirations and real needs of its people and the leadership of local authorities in order to better direct the aid and the many kinds of support of the international community.

It is vital that such a partnership is ultimately based on strong national ownership, in particular in the areas of justice, basic services and the critical functions of the Administration. By receiving international assistance, the State emerging from conflict must regain the exercise of its sovereign prerogatives in

those areas. The partnership between the State receiving assistance and the international community should be carried out under the leadership and governance of the relevant State, even in the absence of national human resources.

We welcome what the United Nations has already undertaken in recent years with training programmes for the civilian and military personnel of States in transition, or already in a post-conflict situation, so that such personnel can take on the tasks transferred to them and replace the external staff deployed in the context of such missions. The situations in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Timor-Leste and Afghanistan are instructive in that regard. Such capacity-building is crucial to better consolidate the gains of peace and post-conflict stabilization.

For its part, the Council has a central role to play given that the mandates of peacekeeping operations increasingly entail consolidation and reconstruction tasks. It is therefore our duty to focus on the structure and new mandates of operations, to ensure that the resources allocated are sufficient for the assigned tasks and to have a bearing on effective implementation in order to fully realize the potential for consolidation and reconstruction in countries emerging from conflict.

My delegation would like to underscore the view of the Advisory Group that assistance to a country in the post-conflict period must respect the country's priorities and real needs. That is the basis of ownership and the guarantee of better results on the ground.

In conclusion, we welcome the establishment of the team that Ms. Malcorra will lead to examine the recommendations contained in the report of the Advisory Group. We are convinced that their conclusions will make it possible to increase the effectiveness of missions on the ground and the possibilities for lasting stability of countries emerging from conflict.

Mr. Pankin (Russian Federation) (spoke in Russian): We are grateful to Mr. Guéhenno and Ms. Malcorra for their briefings on the report of the Senior Advisory Group (see S/2011/85) and to Mr. Gasana, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission, for his comments.

We believe that the report reflects the main problems in peacebuilding. Indeed, it provides excellent food for thought and could serve as a

platform for cooperation among Member States in determining the optimal means of assisting countries overcoming the consequences of conflict. We will carefully study the report, and we are ready for an exchange of views with the various partners.

We support the two main thrusts of the report. The first is that civilian specialists must be deployed rapidly, and second is that deployment must be focused on maximizing the use of and strengthening national institutions and national capacities. Like our colleagues, we are ready to discuss the Secretary-General's recommendations on the subject.

In general and in principle, we would like to note that any form of assistance from the international community must be provided with the consent of national Governments, while respecting national sovereignty and territorial integrity. Assistance should be tailored to each country. It is important to understand that one of the main elements of post-conflict peacebuilding is the strengthening of national institutional capacity. We are pleased that this principle is reflected very clearly in the report.

This universal organization, the United Nations, should play the coordinating role in international peacebuilding efforts, owing to its unique experience and legitimacy. The United Nations should coordinate all efforts by countries to implement the decisions taken. In practical terms, with respect to the concrete proposals in the report, we would like to make several comments.

First, we have questions about the use of reserves in the area of civilian components in United Nations field missions deployed under Security Council mandates. How balanced would that be in terms of geographical representation? How much would it reflect the actual capacity of Member States?

Secondly, in our view, it is important to avoid contradictions between efforts to build capacity in the post-conflict period and the deployment of specialists from international structures outside the United Nations for post-conflict development.

Thirdly, in terms of resources, the report requires further details, given that some of the recommendations will, in our opinion, have serious implications, not only for the current rules, but also for the core principles governing the financing of United Nations field operations. Here I refer in particular to

the degree of control by Member States over the implementation of their decisions and to the use of the Organization's resources that are made available under mandates.

With respect to the recommendations on staff policies, we also believe that there is a need to more closely analyse the reforms recently completed in those areas.

Financing and logistics policies need to be more flexible in terms of how resources are allocated for field mission budgets. Interaction among the various agencies of the United Nations should be enhanced. Also worth mentioning are the components for deploying the global field support strategy, which is being discussed in the General Assembly. We think those ideas should be discussed in detail in the Assembly's Fifth Committee before pursuing their implementation.

We have noted that the report contains several recommendations for creating specialized structures in the Secretariat, such as a Civilian Partnerships Cell, and for studying such partnerships and their creation on the ground. That idea should be studied in advance and its potential functions described in greater detail. On the whole, however, we would prefer to retain the mechanisms already in place.

Reserves could require considerable expense, and there might not be enough specialists. We are ready to continue working with the representatives of the Secretariat in studying the details of the specialist rosters and other mechanisms described in the report.

The review of the recommendations in the report and of the Secretary-General could indeed help the various organs form more effective operational and economical approaches for the deployment of civilian personnel in post-conflict situations.

Ms. Ziade (Lebanon) (spoke in Arabic): I would first like to thank the Secretary-General and the Senior Advisory Group for their efforts in preparing the report before the Council today (see S/2011/85). It contains many important ideas. We would also like to thank Mr. Guéhenno, Ms. Malcorra and Ambassador Gasana for their detailed briefings.

If strengthening civilian capacity does not lead to the establishment of peace, then civilian capacity will not have a direct impact on many vital sectors in terms of peacebuilding, for instance in stabilizing the

security situation, strengthening State institutions and ensuring development. The Security Council has noted the close correlation between strengthening State institutions and social development, on the one hand, and achieving lasting peace, on the other. It did so during the two debates organized this year under the presidencies of Bosnia-Herzegovina and Brazil, respectively (6472nd and 6479th meetings).

In terms of future actions, we welcome the formation of a steering group, to be led by Under-Secretary-General Malcorra, to ensure follow-up of the implementation of the report and its recommendations. We encourage her to ensure that the follow-up process is based on close consultations with Member States and the parties concerned, and that it leads to concrete recommendations on the best way of translating the initiatives described in the report into reality.

In that regard, we would like to highlight three aspects of the report, which in our view should be given close attention as part of efforts to create a road map for the implementation of the report's recommendations.

First is national ownership. Like other speakers, we wish to emphasize the importance of guaranteeing national ownership in societies emerging from conflict. National actors are indeed the primary stakeholders in peacebuilding efforts. They are in the best position to understand the needs of their society and to optimally respond to them.

While the report has devoted considerable attention to the best way of guaranteeing national ownership, it is still true that experience has shown that implementing such initiatives is an extremely complex undertaking. In the future, we hope to see practical proposals for the best way in which to guarantee national ownership, which could be achieved through the activities of civilian experts on the ground, and on how those experts can help to enhance national capacities.

Second is the issue of women's empowerment. Women are essential partners in peacebuilding. We note, however, that this important category is often excluded, in spite of the fact that women account for half of the population of societies emerging from conflict. In this respect, we hope that concrete proposals will be made concerning women's empowerment and involvement that guarantee their economic autonomy and access to basic services, such

as health services and education, in societies emerging from conflict.

Third is the issue of partnerships. Partnerships are a fundamental pillar of the United Nations ability to deploy civilian capacity in a flexible, effective and timely manner. In this respect, we believe that we should first consider the expertise available in the country concerned, and then in the region, and then among countries of the South, and then at the international level. We should clarify the best way for the activities of a civilian partnership cell to contribute to mobilizing the expertise of countries of the South.

Finally, we hope that the United Nations will streamline its consideration of civilian capacity and the challenges ahead, particularly since such consideration is taking place in the broader framework of the efforts of the Secretary-General and Member States to ensure that our Organization can best respond to the needs of societies for peace and development.

Mrs. Viotti (Brazil): Let me join previous speakers in thanking Under-Secretary-General Susana Malcorra, Mr. Jean-Marie Guéhenno and Ambassador Eugène-Richard Gasana for their valuable presentations. We appreciate the comprehensive review undertaken by the Senior Advisory Group on post-conflict civilian capacities, and we wish Ms. Malcorra success in her endeavours as the leader of the Steering Group established by the Secretary-General.

Brazil welcomes this exchange of views on the recommendations presented by the Senior Advisory Group. Given the importance of this issue and its system-wide reach, we would encourage further consultations in a broader setting that can incorporate the views and inputs of the wider membership.

The review is an opportunity to translate into practice the idea that peacekeeping and peacebuilding are parts of an integrated and non-sequential process. Those dimensions are complementary and mutually reinforcing. We cannot lose sight of the main objective of the review, which is to better address the needs of countries emerging from conflicts. In this regard, we appreciate the priority given by the report (see S/2011/85) to the use of national capacities and their development. When international experts are deployed, they must be able to train local personnel and foment their use by the local Government. Just as important, those sent to the field are expected to deal with and

understand the local reality with due regard for the priorities established by national stakeholders.

The sustainability of the gains in security and stability achieved with the help of peacekeeping missions greatly depends upon the capacity of the local Government to resume its core functions. Any successful exit strategy must therefore be accompanied by the development of national capacities and the strengthening of local institutions and political processes. It is thus very important that peacekeeping mandates be supplemented as soon as possible by peacebuilding activities that can help to strengthen national institutions and to develop local expertise. An effective deployment of civilian capacities can give United Nations peacekeeping missions a lighter footprint, as envisioned in the Brahimi report (S/2000/809).

The deployment of military and police forces is one of the distinctive characteristics of peacekeeping. However, the role of the civilian component should not be underestimated. We strongly believe that the deployment of civilian experts to support economic and social policies in the early stages of recovery can create the conditions for a long-lasting peace. We agree that partnerships are an important tool for expanding capacities in post-conflict countries. Cooperation among countries facing similar difficulties is of particular relevance, which makes it preferable to seek international capacities in the same region or to stimulate South-South cooperation, as already underscored by previous speakers.

The use of experts within the modality of experts on mission and the establishment of civilian support packages in close coordination with Member States are interesting options that could enable developing countries to offer more civilian expertise, including in aforementioned areas such as finance management, public administration, health and education. In the context of United Nations peacekeeping, these proposals could contribute to more effective mandate implementation.

Brazil stands ready to contribute to the implementation of the recommendations presented by the Senior Advisory Group with a view to enhancing our collective capacity to help post-conflict countries reach sustainable peace.

Mr. Cabral (Portugal): I would like to start by thanking Under-Secretary-General Susana Malcorra

and the Chair of the Senior Advisory Group, Mr. Jean-Marie Guéhenno, for their briefings on the findings in the report of the independent review on civilian capacity in the aftermath of conflict (S/2011/85) and for their views on the way ahead for the implementation of the suggested recommendations. I also thank Ambassador Gasana for his useful contribution to this debate.

Portugal is very supportive of the approach and of the major findings of the report of the Senior Advisory Group. The report should, in our view, become a reference document for the planning and management of peacebuilding activities, not just by the United Nations, but also by other multilateral and bilateral actors. Allow me to underline some elements related not only to the report but also to the wider topic of civilian capabilities that, in our view, deserve particular attention.

First, I would like to underline the importance of fostering national ownership in initiatives aimed at State-building backed by the international community. There is certainly a long way to go to increase levels of ownership, but the report is very clear in identifying, as the first priority of post-conflict assistance, the strengthening of national capacities for fulfilling core functions of the State. Choices always have to be made. Thus, international efforts should be directed to ensure that decisions on policy objectives and priorities are taken by national actors and that international efforts are there mainly to assist, and not to replace, those of State authorities.

Secondly, we should view civilian assistance tasks as requiring attention from the early stages of post-conflict reconstruction. Mandates should be clear in identifying the role and functions of peacekeepers as early peacebuilders in such areas as the multidimensional tasks of rule of law and security sector reform. The United Nations must ensure a comprehensive and integrated approach to its presence in a given country, and work on concrete measures to improve the linkage between civilian and political tasks and those tasks traditionally performed by peacekeepers. In many situations, this articulation is crucial to preventing a relapse into conflict.

Thirdly, we are very encouraged by the recommendations regarding the capacity of the United Nations to provide the kind of civilian expertise that is needed in a particular post-conflict situation. Our

understanding is that the United Nations must show greater flexibility and adaptability to changing situations. If certain tasks are no longer necessary, resources allocated to those tasks should be transferred to others requiring more attention. The reallocation of resources should be conducted in close consultation with national authorities, identifying and filling existing capacity gaps.

Finally, and in connection with the previous point, I would underline the need for coordination with international actors, which in the report is presented as the establishment of partnerships for ensuring that technical expertise is readily available when needed. Articulation is therefore a central concern in the other stages of post-conflict assistance because it would be much more difficult to adapt and to accommodate different actors at a later stage. However, we should ensure that there is clarity as to who is leading each particular international assistance process in order to avoid duplication of efforts.

Mr. Yang Tao (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I wish to thank Mr. Jean-Marie Guéhenno, Chair of the Senior Advisory Group, and Under-Secretary-General Susana Malcorra for their briefings, as well as Ambassador Gasana for his comments.

Post-conflict peacebuilding is an important part of the United Nations work that is of great significance not only for realizing sustained peace and development in the countries concerned, but also for strengthening the existing collective security system and promoting the common development of humankind. Professional and efficient civilian capacity represents an important foundation and prerequisite for the smooth conduct of the work of the United Nations.

The Senior Advisory Group led by Mr. Guéhenno has submitted its report (see S/2011/85), which contains concrete proposals highlighting ownership, partnership, expertise and nimbleness. China welcomes this. We hope that the Steering Group to be led by Under-Secretary-General Malcorra will seriously study and follow up on the plans so as to formulate workable recommendations for the United Nations.

I wish to elaborate on a number of points. First, full use should be made of the resources of host countries, which would promote ownership by host countries of peacebuilding processes. Given their more in-depth knowledge of their own societies, professionals from host countries can play a unique

role in United Nations peacebuilding activities. More important, after the withdrawal of peacebuilders, a group of professionals will be left behind in host countries, thus reinforcing national capacities and sustaining peace and development.

Secondly, the targeted selection of personnel should be strengthened. Security sector reform, the rule of law, human rights and economic and social development are the priorities for peacebuilding. The United Nations and the international community should, in line with the conditions and needs of the host country, focus on recruiting, selecting and training professionals in these areas, thus contributing to the capacity-building of the host countries.

Thirdly, personnel management should be strengthened. We must focus on taking advantage of the expertise to be found in developing countries and regional organizations, and step up efforts to recruit civilian experts from developing countries. Members of the United Nations should be encouraged to actively train and recommend talent to the United Nations, and to work with the United Nations in building and replenishing talent pools. In recruiting civilian experts, the Secretariat should continue to implement the principles of openness, equity and transparency, improve its vetting procedures, and seek in advance opinions of Member States relating to mechanisms, criteria and guiding principles.

Fourthly, reliable financial resources and security must be provided. We hope that countries in a position to do so will continue to provide practical support and that the United Nations will further optimize its management mechanisms and make rational use of existing resources so as to achieve the maximum possible benefits.

Mrs. Ogbu (Nigeria): The Nigerian delegation would like to thank Mr. Guéhenno for his concise briefing and his able stewardship of the Senior Advisory Group for the Review of International Civilian Capacities. We are also grateful to Ms. Malcorra for sharing the invaluable perspective of the Department of Field Support on this issue. We also recognize the presence of Ambassador Gasana, Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, and appreciate his contribution to this debate.

The civilian capacity review is an ambition yet necessary advancement in the effort to make our service delivery more responsive to the needs of

Member States in the twenty-first century. As threats to peace and stability increasingly arise from health and environmental hazards, as well as from armed conflict, our response mechanisms must be recalibrated and optimized. The framework so well delineated in the report before us (see S/2011/85) provides a solid foundation for this project. Nigeria accordingly supports the vision of the review.

The four key pillars which frame the recommendations are very well defined. They aim to strengthen national ownership, broaden and deepen the pool of international civilian capacity and improve the appropriateness, timeliness and effectiveness of United Nations support. There are several peacekeeping and peacebuilding programmes that would benefit from a better harnessing of the capacities of all actors. Indeed, transition situations, such as in South Sudan, that we have identified this morning present opportunities to identify best practices in applying civilian capabilities in consonance with nationally determined priorities.

The need to assess local needs and existing local capacities, including the capacity to absorb assistance, before we even set about deploying international capacities has often been central to our discussion, especially in the Council. This is mostly true of countries emerging from conflict, which face critical shortages of the capacities and institutions to sustain peace. The United Nations system has an obligation to support the development of home-grown capacities while temporarily filling the gaps to re-establish the rule of law and restore basic services.

With this review, we now have a policy proposal that will determine how these strategies are implemented in the field. As the report seeks to enlist all the key actors in this endeavour, we are encouraged by the initial steps taken by the United Nations Development Programme and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) to review their needs and capacity assessment methodologies to better attune their work in the field. We sincerely hope that the DPKO and the Council can together find ways to reflect certain elements of the review when renewing peacekeeping mandates.

I must say that we are encouraged that the review addressed even the most sensitive areas of analysis, including training for better leaders among a civilian core and creating a culture of accountability. The recommendations in this regard acknowledge that, as a

facilitator and partner for peace, the United Nations must be guided in its every action by the needs and priorities of the communities that we serve.

Nigeria would very much like to see this review as a catalyst for change. It is with satisfaction, therefore, that we welcome the Secretary-General's decision to establish a Steering Group empowered to facilitate decision-making and pursue coordinated action. We have no doubt that Ms. Malcorra is up to the task of leading the Steering Group. We look forward to receiving the formal views of the Secretary-General and his proposals on concrete reform measures and resource allocation.

The civilian capacity review enjoins all of us to utilize available resources more effectively and more efficiently, to seek out and deploy our brightest and best, and to draw on the full range of global and national capacities. In that way, we can increase the ability of the United Nations to keep pace with changing circumstances in the field.

In concluding, I must state that Nigeria has invaluable experience in building international civilian capacities. The Nigerian Technical Aid Corps Scheme, since its inception 17 years ago, has deployed over 2,000 volunteers to complement national efforts to fill capacity gaps in more than 27 African, Caribbean and Pacific countries, in the true spirit of South-South cooperation. Indeed, we have shared technical know-how and expertise with recipient countries based on assessed and perceived needs. In supporting the review, we are willing to offer lessons learned and to work closely with the United Nations.

Mr. Barbalic (Bosnia and Herzegovina): Bosnia and Herzegovina highly appreciates this debate on civilian capacity in the aftermath of conflict. We thank Mr. Jean-Marie Guéhenno for his briefing. We commend the Senior Advisory Group under his leadership, which provided the Secretary-General with important advice on how to better develop, recruit and rapidly deploy civilian expertise, in close cooperation with national authorities, in order to meet the urgent needs of post-conflict countries. We welcome setting up the Steering Group and the appointment of Ms. Susana Malcorra to provide strategic oversight, views and advice on follow-up and implementation of the review. Of course, we thank Ms. Malcorra and the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, Ambassador Gasana, for their remarks today.

The debate on institution-building during the Bosnia and Herzegovina presidency in January (see S/PV.6472) emphasized the critical role of national ownership in peacebuilding and of drawing on existing national expertise to support the development of national capacity. We are convinced that enhancing the capacity of national institutions should be seen as a core issue of peacebuilding and that this process is among the most relevant steps towards improving the United Nations peacekeeping and peacebuilding performance.

We emphasize that building accountable, legitimate and resilient institutions should be a strategic objective from the early stages of a peacebuilding process. Priority has to be given to the development of those institutions that will prevent relapse into conflict, progressively reduce dependence on the international community's capacities, and promote self-reliance by creating stable, viable and responsive domestic institutions.

In the past, we have seen how the international community has, in particular cases, faced challenges and difficulties in promoting the national capacities necessary for an enduring peace in a post-conflict environment. The civilian aspects of post-conflict peacebuilding often lag behind police and military efforts in given settings.

We support recommendations on prioritizing national capacities and providing expertise tailored and adapted to the specific needs of a post-conflict country. Strengthening national ownership of peace processes by supporting core Government functions, such as aid coordination and policy management, is essential. Nurturing national capacities can contribute to improving the economic impact of various international interventions and achieving sustainable peace. The co-location of international experts is desirable when needed and where appropriate.

The issue of civilian capacity is of a cross-cutting nature. We are of the view that it provides an opportunity for improving cooperation with Member States in this area. Creating an effective mechanism for cooperation will enable peacekeeping operations or political missions to draw upon the civilian capacities of Member States or regional organizations while the United Nations acts as a platform for qualified expertise. It should contribute to better matching needs with capacities. Nevertheless, the United Nations needs

to work more on better coordinating its activities with Member States in order to make more efficient use of existing capacity. Improving guidance on enabling capacity-building and improving training resources is especially important. Planning processes need to include host Government views, expertise and priorities from the outset.

It is necessary to clarify roles and responsibilities with regard to the lead responsibility for the development and deployment of civilian expertise in core peacebuilding sectors. We believe it crucial to harmonize overlapping mandates and various policy perspectives with a view to providing agile and more relevant United Nations support.

Responding to changing circumstances requires greater flexibility in everyday operations in the field. To that end, getting the right people to the right places at the right time is an imperative and requires the system to define areas of responsibility and accountability. The United Nations must ensure that planning processes have sufficient capacities to adequately address gender issues. The participation of women and their inclusion in all processes is of the utmost importance.

Although some recommendations from this review can be easily and quickly implemented, we are fully aware that a number of them will require more detailed elaboration and certain organizational reform. We support the application of recommendations related to national ownership, capacity-building and lessons learned in order to achieve a practical difference on the ground.

Work in conflict-affected areas entails the transformation of United Nations structures, using lessons learned, drawing on the expertise of Member States and other bodies, and innovative methods of work for mandate delivery and operational success. Greater flexibility and better responsiveness to nationally identified priorities are indispensable. While the United Nations is the most legitimate agent of the international community, civilian capacity is undoubtedly an integral part therefore.

The United Nations, Member States, international organizations and donors must do more in order to increase flexibility, efficiency and the impact of our common efforts in post-conflict settings. Designing adequate responses, choosing the right mix of instruments at the right time, allocating resources

based on comparative advantage and the search for optimal solutions never end. Finally, responsive civilian capacity is a shared responsibility in supporting and building durable peace.

Mr. Alzate (Colombia) (spoke in Spanish): My delegation thanks Mr. Jean-Marie Guéhenno for his statement and, through him, all the members of the Senior Advisory Group who contributed to the report on the civilian capacity in the aftermath of conflict (see S/2011/85). We also thank Ms. Susanna Malcorra, Under-Secretary-General for Field Support, Ambassador Gasana, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission, for their comprehensive statements.

In recent months, the Security Council has held a series of debates in which a clear need has been recognized to analyse and develop strategies to allow us better to respond to the major challenges facing our Organization, to effectively and efficiently address the needs of post-conflict societies, and to prevent the resurgence of conflict. The establishment and improvement of civilian capacities are crucial to the support that the international community must provide to countries emerging from conflict so as to ensure that, in the medium and long terms, the State and society in question are able independently to deliver the services and public assets that make it possible not only to stabilize and build peace, but also to strengthen processes towards national unity and the well-being and development of their people.

It is well known that there is no one-size-fits-all solution and that strategies to respond to the challenges of a post-conflict situation must be based on a very specific analysis of conditions in the field. The Senior Advisory Group's approach is therefore of particular relevance, given that the four core principles on which its report focuses reflect the general framework within which the United Nations can take nimble, timely and coordinated action with respect to civilian capacity-building, in full compliance with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

National ownership is undoubtedly a guiding principle in enhancing civilian capacity-building in all its aspects. In that respect, ongoing cooperation and consultations with States emerging from conflict are *sine qua non* to identifying key Government functions to be prioritized as the need to resort to international capacity in essential areas is assessed. It is also of the greatest importance to give pride of place to national

markets for the provision of goods and services as a way of stimulating local economies and identifying local needs. Partnership with other interested parties is another factor that must be the focus of special attention.

While nimble and flexible instruments are needed to provide specialized capacities that the Organization is not always in a position to furnish, the quality and legal framework of its performance and the accountability of its partners must meet the standards required by the United Nations. There is also a need for the Organization to provide clear leadership in the execution of the tasks included in mandates.

In addressing the issue of technical competencies, the report once again shows the need to ensure that the entire United Nations system works in a coordinated and coherent manner, with a view to avoiding duplication and ensuring efficient use of available resources. In that context, human resource management must address the need to quickly and efficiently deploy specialized personnel in large-scale field operations, without creating unnecessary disparities and while preserving geographical diversity and promoting merit.

There is a clear need to establish more flexible, timely and cost-efficient systems, providing flexibility with regard to the responses required by the changing environment on the ground. In that regard, it is essential to give the necessary consideration to budgetary implications and contributions from States, as well as the need to fulfil the mandates established by the competent bodies of the Organization.

Conflict-affected countries need effective national political processes, strong institutions and economic development to build lasting peace. Supporting those processes with civilian capacities that respond to local needs and priorities while also building national capacities to that end is a shared responsibility of affected societies and the international community. We encourage the Steering Group to continue the process of broad consultations already begun, paying the necessary attention to the views of all States.

The President (spoke in French): I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of France.

I would like to thank Mr. Guéhenno, Ms. Malcorra and Ambassador Gasana for their briefings.

It is logical for the General Assembly to have yesterday considered the report on civilian capacity in the aftermath of conflict (see S/2011/85), which the Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission introduced during today's debate, just as it is that the Secretariat has already begun to follow-up the proposals of the Senior Advisory Group led by Jean-Marie Guéhenno. The implementation of the report requires a joint effort by the entire United Nations, including the commitment of the Secretariat and the support of Member States, as was the case with the Brahimi report on peacekeeping operations and military capacities (S/2000/809).

The report on civilian capacity in the aftermath of conflict is part of our efforts to improve the performance of the United Nations on the ground. We have a collective interest in ensuring that its goals are achieved. Moreover, we should avoid ideological debates and focus on the essential, namely, how to get the most benefit from the report that has been presented to us and how to help the Secretariat to implement it in the best way possible.

I should like to focus on three issues that are at the heart of the reflection carried out by the experts that are of direct concern to the Security Council.

First of all, the priority is national ownership. As we have said frequently in Security Council debates, there can be no lasting reconstruction without national ownership. In that regard, as rightly pointed out in the report, local human resources within civilian capacity support structures in post-conflict countries is of crucial importance.

Secondly, partnerships must be expanded. The Senior Advisory Group has suggested establishing a civilian partnerships cell to facilitate matching needs with the capacities of different countries. That is exactly what France proposed in the context of the Group of Eight working group on peacekeeping and peacebuilding, which we currently chair. In that regard, countries of the South can provide more civilian capacity. That does not mean that the countries of the North can forego their responsibility in the areas of peacekeeping and development. It is not a matter of transferring the burden, but rather of taking advantage of more effective expertise by virtue of being closer to reality on the ground. The goal should be to strengthen the trilateral cooperation between donors, those that

provide personnel and the host country. This is a concern for everyone.

Lastly, we should encourage initiative on the ground. We therefore support the idea proposed by the Senior Advisory Group to provide a broader margin for decision-making to Special Representatives of the Secretary-General in the internal management of civilian resources. This is a productive proposal that could improve coordination with the funds, programmes and agencies in the use of their resources, thereby contributing to instilling a culture based on results in the management of resources.

As we see routinely in our debates in the Council, the needs with regard to civilian capacity are numerous, varied and tend to increase with the complexity of the situations in which United Nations intervention is required. The United Nations must therefore be able to adapt, often in a short span of time. Effectiveness requires a certain level of flexibility in the use of civilian capacity. It also requires rigorous and responsible management of financial and human resources.

Following up on these recommendations cannot be done without the participation of all Member States and on the basis of consensus. The recommendations to be made by the Secretary-General should be considered by the entire membership, in particular at the Fifth Committee. We cannot properly carry out these important reforms without moving ahead gradually and in unison.

I once again thank Mr. Jean-Marie Guéhenno for the excellent work done by the Senior Advisory Group on civilian capacity. I also thank the Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission for his interest in the report. Lastly, I think that I can say on behalf of the entire Council that we have every confidence in Ms. Susana Malcorra in connection with the follow-up she has initiated on the experts' proposals. We shall closely consider the next report on the Secretary-General on this subject.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.